

---

ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum - ICANN Public Forum  
Thursday, March 10, 2022 - 14:30 to 16:00 AST

KATHY SCHNITT: So welcome to the ICANN73 Public Forum. We will now turn it over to Maarten Botterman, ICANN Board Chair.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that. And thank you for joining us today for ICANN73 --

Recording in progress.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for joining for the ICANN73 Public Forum, our first public meeting of the year. Came at a time when our thoughts are with those who are suffering. A country with 40 million people is under attack. People feel unsafe in their houses and in the streets. And many made a difficult choice to leave everything that they have built up during their lifetime behind.

This situation has made ICANN Board even more aware of the need to do what we can do, to help maintain secure and stable operations of the Internet's DNS, recognizing that in these times,

---

***Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.***

---

the Internet can be a literal lifeline for people who need access to information.

As humans, we are deeply concerned and saddened about what is happening to so many people in the region. As the ICANN Board, we felt that the least we could do is to contribute financial assistance to facilitate Internet access for users in Ukraine where connectivity and access to information is needed most.

And we asked our CEO to do what's possible. The ICANN CEO and our Org colleagues are working on this at their best ability, beyond continuing the work that's already on their plate. And I'm deeply grateful for that.

There have also been expressions of support throughout the week, and I'm truly humbled by this. It's good to be able to recognize that all of ICANN cares. In time of despair, every bit of help is a double effect. It makes a practical difference. It also makes clear to people in despair that they do not stand alone, that the world cares.

Thank you all for the warm expressions of support throughout the week. We very much recognize that the actions we do now are a first step. Over time, we will evaluate whether and how we may make such a permanent provision available for emergency

---

situations. Right now, our hearts go out to the people of Ukraine. And we wish them the best possible outcome towards their future.

And now to the session at hand. On behalf of the Board, I encourage you to take advantage of this opportunity to ask questions, make comments, and share your thoughts. These public forums are very important to us. We cannot do our job well if we don't hear from you.

It is our responsibility to act in the collective interest of all stakeholders and to hear directly from you about what's on your mind.

We have much work to progress together. And there's been many productive discussions this week about SSAD progress, subsequent procedures, the prioritization framework, and other equally important subjects.

Several of these initiatives allow us to evolve how we evaluate and implement our recommendations and policies.

The Board is prepared to step forward more proactively to facilitate the bottom-up multistakeholder process to progress the work. And, of course, we are committed to continuous

---

improvement in getting the job done together in a bottom-up, multistakeholder way.

Please also remember that this session is not a replacement for the public comments that ICANN is seeking on various issues and policies. If you want to weigh in on a specific issue that is out for public comment, please use the online system available on [icann.org](https://icann.org) website. This is the only way your comments will receive proper consideration from the appropriate committee, supporting organization, and staff members. Thank you for being here.

I look forward to your questions and comments with my colleagues. And before we begin, Sally Newell Cohen from ICANN Org, will explain the format of today's session.

Sally, please.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Thanks very much, Maarten.

Hello, everyone, and welcome. As Maarten said, I'm Sally Cohen. I'm the senior vice president of global communications and language services at ICANN Org.

---

I'm going to briefly explain the format for this session and how you can participate. Today's public forum will last an hour and 30 minutes. The session will be divided into three blocks. All three blocks are open to any subject of community interest. And each block will be facilitated by a Board member starting with Sarah Deutsch, followed by Avri Doria, and then Patricio Poblete.

Now, once the first block begins, you can virtually queue up in two different ways. If you want to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please click on the "raise hand" icon at the bottom of your screen and you will automatically go into the speakers' queue. When it's your turn to speak, you will see a message on your screen requesting that you unmute your mic. This lets you know that it's soon going to be your turn to speak. And once you've been introduced, please be sure that you unmute your microphone as well.

And before starting your comment or question, please do state your name, where you're from, and who you're representing or affiliated with, if applicable. And remember, it's hard to do this -- but remember to speak slowly and clearly so that the scribes and interpreters can correctly capture your words.

---

If you're unable to voice your question or comment, please write it in the Zoom Q&A pod. My colleague Alexandra Dans will read the questions aloud.

Please don't ask your questions in the chat pod. We're not tracking questions or monitoring them in the chat pod, so we'll only be reading your question or comment if it's in the Q&A pod.

And when submitting a question into that pod, or a comment, please also be sure to include your name, where you're from, and who you're representing or affiliated with.

Now the time rules. The time rules will be the same as they have always been at the Public Forums. Each person will have two minutes to make a statement or pose your question, and you'll see the two-minute timer on the screen. And of course we use this time limit to ensure that as many people can participate as possible.

The Board shepherd will either answer your question or turn to the board member or ICANN org, the person who is best equipped to answer your question.

I should also note at this point that when the question or comment is posed, we may need just a couple of seconds, the

---

Board may need to determine who the best person is and who is best prepared to respond.

Please also note that if you have a follow-up question, we ask that you reenter the queue. This again ensures that everybody has an opportunity to pose a question or comment during the time.

The two-minute rule will also apply to any follow-up questions later or any comments.

For interpretation, please don't hesitate to take advantage of the skilled interpreters that we have supporting us. Real-time interpretation is available for the standard U.N. languages: English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, and Russian. You can find more information about this on the session's page, and a link available in the chat box.

Remember also you can simply click on the icon for interpretation and select your language. We always recommend that you do this so that you can quickly be -- to hear if someone is speaking in a different language other than your native language.

And I'd also like to take just a second to thank our incredibly skilled interpreters for making this feature available, and again

---

remind everyone to speak slowly and as clearly as possible so that they're able to interpret.

With that, we're going to open up our first block. And our first Board facilitator is Sarah Deutsch. So, Sarah, over to you, please.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thanks so much, Sally, and welcome, everyone. The Board really encourages your questions. We enjoy this interaction, and I encourage new people as well as existing ICANN stakeholders to please join the queue.

So, Sally, people would need to just click the raise your hand -- right? -- to get in the queue?

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: That's right, that's right. And we already have some in the queue.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Perfect if you could --

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Nigel Roberts.



---

SARAH DEUTSCH: Oh, hey Nigel. Good to hear from you. Please ask your question.

You may be muted, Nigel.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Yep.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I pressed unmute already twice. Can you hear me now?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Now we can.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you.

I want to -- Sarah, board members, I want to say a couple of words and solicit the Board's comments about the recent request from the government of the Ukraine that ICANN should remove one or more TLDs from the root zone of the Domain Name System. First of all, I understand the burden of responsibility and duty you carry, and I applaud you for doing that. When you receive a request like this, you have to respond one way or the other. Creating an action is not an option. And I'd like to commend

---

Göran and the staff for the caring consideration of ICANN's response. It appears well considered and not simply a knee-jerk reaction. I think it was the right response but with this very important caveat: It's the right response at this time in the circumstances as they obtain today. Revocation of a ccTLD manager's role is an extremely major step not to be undertaken lightly, and certainly not without due process and creating a right of appeal and full consideration of the rights of Internet users within the domain, who would be collateral damage.

On the other hand, it is pretty hard to sustain an argument that the unprovoked full-scale, armed invasion by the public authorities of one country does not constitute a form of substantial misbehavior. And it's right, as governments and private businesses have come together and done throughout the world, to take action in response.

ICANN, much as it might find it exceedingly uncomfortable, appears to find itself in the position that SWIFT found it in 2014. As a body founded in international private law, we will no doubt be seen globally as no different.

To literally follow the request received from Ukraine would have far-reaching consequences, many of them unintended. Many resources elsewhere in the world may depend on the proper

---

functioning of domains registered. Free flow of information to and from the people of Europe, particularly Russia, will be inhibited. That is the exact opposite of what needs to happen right now. Channels or objective objection are drying up. And the effect on the legitimacy of the multistakeholder model of Internet governance, I have no doubt that will be seriously damaged, likely even fatally so.

Apologize for running so quickly, but I'm trying to keep within two minutes.

Finally, I've got a warning. Where world affairs is concerned, ICANN cannot operate in a vacuum. It's very tempting to respond to these with the same repetitive tropes about neutrality of the management of the Internet system unique identifiers, but that would be a mistake, and I am relieved ICANN to note that has not fallen into that error.

Finally, I would just say what Ken Olsen said and which informed the corporate philosophy of digital equipment throughout its existence: Whatever you do, make sure you do the right thing.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Nigel, for your heartfelt comment. We appreciate that.

---

Alexandra, do you want to tell us who is next in the queue?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Hi. Thank you, Sarah. I believe we have a question in the written queue, Q&A pod, but it was answered, and I don't see of you -- yes, now I see one. This is Andrey.

Andrey Shcherbovich, you can ask your question.

ANDREY SHCHERBOVICH: Sorry, I was muted. My name is Andrey Shcherbovich. I am from Montreal Canada, and I am fellow for the next ICANN74.

And I would like to -- first of all, to mention that this connection of Russia from the global Internet will be favor for Russian propaganda because Internet is the only possible -- because Internet is the only possible source of information for people who are aggrieved in the area of Ukraine.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you for your comment, Andrey. I don't hear a question there, but we appreciate your comment.

Who is next in the queue, Alex?

---

ALEXANDRA DANS: Sarah, thank you. We don't have a written question right now.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay.

ALEXANDRA DANS: We don't have anyone in the audio queue either.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Oh, well, people, don't be shy. Come on, we want to hear from you, so...

ALEXANDRA DANS: We received one just now, Sarah.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Oh, perfect.

ALEXANDRA DANS: From Jeffrey Newman: I agree with neutrality with respect to IANA PTI services. That said, a lot of what the ICANN org and community do has no impact on the security and stability of the DNS. This includes where ICANN has offices, who ICANN hires as contractors, who ICANN funds to attend meetings, where

---

meetings occur, et cetera. None of this impacts security and stability of the DNS. Will ICANN consider taking action in any of these areas that do not impact security?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thanks for your question, Jeff.

Göran, do you want to respond to that?

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you, Jeff, for the question. We often, at ICANN, talk about the importance of staying home, making a point, trying to go to make a change. We have people in I think now 45 countries in the word. We have offices, as you know, in several places. And the -- the contractors that we use are often -- often, in this case, that we use them for support of the ICANN community.

It would be fair to say that we have not thought about it in such a way that would take into -- take into account some of the things that I think you're mentioning. We will continue to think about that when we -- deliberately we go on.

The security also of my staff, as you know, is highly important to me, and also to you. This is a -- with that said, as it is right now, the -- when we look at the current situation, we focus on

---

supporting the ICANN community, the ICANN Board to do our best job.

But it's a very good question, and I know, Jeff, that you didn't mean it as a pointed question. It's more a reflection that we all have to adapt and learn going forward.

Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thanks for that, Göran.

Do we have other folks in the queue or other written questions?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Thank you, Sarah.

We have an audio queue. I believe the first one is from Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.

---

I have a suggestion I would like to make. We have a global situation with COVID, and we have many issues with connection in some countries of our community.

We suggested the creation of an ICANN foundation, an ICANN foundation for domain names, for identifiers. We could have an ICANN foundation that could support those initiatives to improve Internet connectivity for the community and help the population as well.

We know that we have a fund for the Internet infrastructure in Ukraine. But for the sustainability of this type of initiative, maybe the creation of a foundation would be a good thing.

Thank you very much.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you so much for your suggestion.

Göran, did you want to answer this one?

GÖRAN MARBY: I literally don't know why you pointed to me, because the whole of the board could say that.



---

I mean, thank you very much for the idea. I think that we share and the board shares --

Maarten, you should actually answer this. Sorry.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Go ahead, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just thanks for your question.

We will think of how this could extend towards the future for now. But this is where we are now. We felt rapid action was necessary, and we will review how to best move forward on this. So really appreciate your suggestion.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Great. Thank you.

And I think we had a written Q&A. Alex, do you want to read what's in that pod?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Thank you, Sarah.

---

And we received a question from Kevin Murphy, Domain Insight. This is a question for Mr. Marby, Mr. Botterman, and any other director who would like to respond.

While it is generally accepted that ICANN is not in the business of deciding what is or is not a country, do you agree that the Soviet Union does not meet the objective criteria for ccTLD eligibility? And would you support dot SU entering the ccTLD retirement process as and when that process is approved?

Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Maarten or Göran? Who would like to -- Sure. Go ahead, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Happy to take it.

It is correct that the Soviet Union is no longer a site in the eye so 3116.1 standard and therefore is no longer considered eligible for a ccTLD.

ICANN org has actually held discussion with the domain in the past to arrange an orderly retirement of the domain. And the ccNSO asked ICANN org starting in 2010 and reiterated in 2017 to

---

pause its efforts to retire the domain so that the policy development process could be conducted. And that is a request we have honored.

So we're glad to report that the ccNSO recently concluded that policy development process and sent its policy recommendation to the ICANN board.

We will soon evaluate the ccNSO policy recommendations, and we will do so in line with the bylaws process.

I hope this helps.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Great. Thank you for clarifying that, Maarten.

And, Alex, I'm going to turn it back to you to tell us who is next in the queue.

ALEXANDRA DANS: We have Tom Barrett in the queue.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Hi, Tom.

---

Is this written or oral question?

TOM BARRETT:

Can you hear me okay? This is Tom Barrett from EnCirca. It's an ICANN-accredited registrar formed in 2001.

And as you all are aware, the growth of blockchain technologies has led to a proliferation of alternative roots. Some of these exist as a supporting role for specific blockchains, such as Ethereum, with their .ETH, or Solana, with .SOL, but there are other blockchain projects whose primary purpose is to replace the ICANN root or launch additional alternative roots, such as Unstoppable Domains and Handshake.

And, of course, none of these alternative roots are part of ICANN's unified root and all lack ICANN's consensus policies and the rights protection mechanisms.

And so I wanted to ask the board how they envisioned, if at all, how ICANN might get involved in developing policies for these alternative roots.

SARAH DEUTSCH:

Thank you, Tom, for the question.

---

I'm going to turn it over to Kaveh to respond.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes. Thank you very much. Thank you for the question.

I will try to answer it in two points.

One, ICANN board and ICANN org in the form of office of CTO closely follow developments there. We actually have a current agenda item in Board Technical Committee meetings, so we discuss and get updated on new developments.

And then the office of the CTO as well keeps monitoring them.

We have been invited to -- have -- I think it was back in 2017, we have invited in two different ICANN meetings, one of them with the Board Technical Committee, the other with the technical expert's group, invited some of the core developers of two of the (indiscernible) technologies of using blockchain for names and they presented to us and to the community.

That said, for ICANN to basically also get into coming up with policies for those spaces, Internet workspace on adoption; correct? Right now, DNS is the one and only adopted technology

---

for global resolution of names. And our mission is clear. Part of it actually mentions DNS.

But, of course, that's if, globally, humanity wants to use another name space or annex another name space to the current DNS name space, of course, we will need to consider that. And that would come from the community. We would monitor if this is something interesting. Of course, we would feed back and let the community, the constituencies, know.

But, in general, we are focused on (indiscernible). We are more than happy, if the community really wants to enter that and basically give us the authority to basically start looking at policies for them, and basically start looking at enforcement. As you well know, many of these technologies, one of the biggest limits of many of these technologies -- not all of them -- is that they don't allow enforcement. So it is very binary, which might be interesting for the start. But we know that that model cannot stay. We need to be able to have external control over -- for things like intellectual property, et cetera.

I hope this answers your question.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Kaveh.

---

And just a reminder for board members and participants, speak slowly so our translators can take note of everything you're saying.

So, Alexandra, who is next in the queue?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Thank you, Sarah. We have a written question from Mouloud Khelif, an ICANN fellow.

What is the board planning to do with org and/or the community to improve, facilitate onboarding of newcomers to the ICANN ecosystem beyond fellowship and NextGen programs?

Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thanks so much for that question. I'm going to turn the floor over to Leon to answer.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Sarah. This is Leon Sanchez. I'm going to switch to the Spanish channel so we can take advantage of the translation services.

---

Hello. Thank you very much for your question.

As you know, there are different programs that you may use so that you may join the ICANN community. You have mentioned the fellowship program. It is one of the programs. NextGen is another program that I would like you to check upon the resources available at ICANN Learn. In that site, you may find lots of resources, different resources, so as to continue learning on what is going on at ICANN, what ICANN does.

You can also go to (indiscernible) of a fellowship program, so Next Gen Program, that, based on my experience, I recommend you to participate in the discussions held through mailing lists. The meetings that are held intersessionally and within this active participation, I guess you will learn a lot, and pretty fast.

Anyway, if you have any doubt, you may contact me, and I will help you.

Thank you very much.

SARAH DEUTSCH:

Thank you, Leon. And, by the way, when he says, "in my experience," Leon was a fellow originally. So he's speaking,



---

definitely, from his own experiences. And we definitely encourage that.

So, Alexandra, who is next in the queue?

ALEXANDRA DANS: We have an audio question from Steve DelBianco.

Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve DelBianco here.

After you unmuted me, I muted myself.

I think that the European Commission study of DNS abuse has been a very important topic this week. So I have one question about that.

Setting aside disagreements over the definition that the researchers proposed, I did hear general agreement and acknowledgment that at least one of the three types of DNS abuse in the research study are within ICANN's remit. So at least one of those types are within ICANN's remit. I think you know what I'm talking about. It's type one. It's maliciously registered domains.

---

Ordinarily part of a batch where several are blacklisted, and which are there are expressly to use in command and control botnet works or for spam.

So I would like to hear the board's reaction to whether that's clearly within the remit and what we can do in terms of policy development and enforcement of contracts to start to address at least that one type of DNS abuse.

Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Maarten, would you like to respond?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sorry. I missed part of the -- the first part of the question.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Well, why don't we let Jim take the first part of it, or take this first, and then we'll -- we can come back to you if you want to add on.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks.

---

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Sarah.

And thank you, Steve, for the question.

I do think it's important to recognize that the board really depends on the ICANN community to indicate how it wants to evaluate these kinds of things. The European Commission report was something which was commissioned by them. The E.C. study on DNS abuse, I'm sorry, was commissioned by the E.C. And it's for the community to take that input and decide what to do with it.

Certainly, we are already in a place that we acknowledge and take action on a number of things that were discussed there. And what else we might do with it really just depends on what actions the community wants to take with it.

So thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thanks, Jim. And I hope that answers your question, Steve.

Alexandra, who is next in the queue?

---

ALEXANDRA DANS: Thank you, Sarah. And so I have a question from Oksana Prykhodko.

Thank you very much for all your support to Ukraine. Maarten said that it will be continued. We -- will highly appreciate and hoping for an ICANN office in Ukraine.

What do you think about it?

SARAH DEUTSCH: That's -- Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for your suggestion. I would say this is not a time where we decide on that. But appreciate your suggestion. Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Great. Thank you very much.

I think at this point, I would like to turn the baton over to Avri Doria to continue moderating the session.

Avri?

---

AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thank you, Sarah.

And thank you so far for all the questions. And opening up now, so, Alexandra, can you tell me who is next?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Yes. Thank you, Avri. So the next question would be an audio question from Jeffrey Neuman.

AVRI DORIA: Go ahead, Jeff, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. Thank you, takes a second to unmute.

I want to follow up on Tom Barrett's question on the alternate roots to just supplement it a little bit.

So there are three and a half million names, top-level domains, within the Handshake system alone. There are hundreds of thousands of names in the other systems.

So the question, which I know can't really be answered now, but is something we all have to think about, is that many of these

---

owners of the three and a half million names intend to object to ICANN's delegation of similar strings than what exists in the handshake or other alternate roots. So what needs to be thought of is, what is ICANN going to do when someone applies in the next round of new gTLDs for a string that is in any of these alternate roots and the owners of these alternate roots come forward and claim collision? Right? There's going to be a ton of intentional name collisions.

So while I appreciate the answer that was given of that you follow what's going on in the world and the technological developments, we need to anticipate questions that we know are going -- or issues we know are going to arise.

And I can tell you right now that collision, there are intentional attempts at collision or to causing collision so that to prevent ICANN from delegating those strings in the future.

So this is something that is incredibly important for the ICANN community and something we all need to pay attention to now and not in a few years when the process launches.

Thanks.

---

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Jeff. Thank you for the question.

And I think you're right, it is an important thing to think about. I think it's one of the things that NCAP is thinking about.

And perhaps I can pass this on to Jim or Kaveh, if you have more to add about how it connects into the NCAP work and beyond.

JIM GALVIN:

So thank you, Jeff. I will jump in again here.

Yes, you know, the board has certainly not made yet a firm decision on what to do going forward about name collisions. And as you well know, Jeff, SubPro offered its set of recommendations on what to do about name collisions and some concerns that it has.

And the board -- what they have done is sponsor a project, the Name Collision Analysis Project, which has been going on for several years, but expects, hopefully, we'll finish quite soon. And it's going to be providing guidance for consideration by the community and by the board for how to address name collisions in the future.

---

So what I would suggest at this point is, there's still an opportunity for the community to join NCAP and be a part of that discussion or certainly to look out for future public comment opportunities as the final report comes around to join that work and be a part of the guidance that the ICANN board and ICANN org receives on how to deal with those issues.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Jim. And thanks for spelling out NCAP, which I probably should have done when I first mentioned it. And, you know, probably should have more conversations on this following up to see where, indeed, the questions could be best placed.

Alexandra, can you give me the next questioner, please.

ALEXANDRA DANS:

Avri, the next question is from Mark Datysgeld.

I would like to know if ICANN has any plans to create and promote IDN versions of its ICANN org domain, a suggestion long given by our UASG friend Dusan Stojicevic. It would show great commitment to the UA mission.



---

AVRI DORIA: Thank you for the question, Mark.

There have been discussions about it. I do think there are possibly some barriers in terms of official reserved names list and such. I know that it's a favorite project of Göran's.

And I wonder if there's anyone else that would like to add anything to it. Perhaps, Göran, you would add something to it?

GÖRAN MARBY: Edmon has his hand up. He can start and I can go on to my favorite project.

AVRI DORIA: Sorry. I missed that.

Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: No worries. It's also my favorite project, I guess at least in terms of IDN and UA.

Thank you for the question.

---

I think it -- we are definitely exploring the -- how we want to do this. And this is something that's top of my mind.

Overall, in general, of course, ICANN is lining its own domain with the broader UA and IDN goals and reaching out to those who are not already on the Internet as well because of, you know, this navigation tool is not in their language and maybe this could help.

And I think ICANN overall needs to -- is still going through the UA process itself. And that is important. And I do take note that the actual domain icann.org, if expressed in different languages, would send a strong message.

So I do take that.

And also, I think one of the -- the aspects that Avri mentioned is the reserved names list, but also on TLD level, I think we should be creative in thinking about that and ICANN org should think about, you know, even .ICANN or dot something that makes sense.

How that will, you know, come, I don't think this would be an org-only or a board-only initiative. This would involve some -- you know, at the top level, it would involve some community discussion for sure.

---

But at the second level and -- as you suggested earlier, that is something that I think we would definitely take back and try to put that in place and see -- and report back, I guess, once we have second-level domains that we can use to -- to re- -- I guess represent ICANN in the domain and promote IDN and UA.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Edmon. And thank you for sort of correcting the wrong direction I had taken this in. I heard one thing, but I actually heard the wrong thing, and partially because of the conversations we've had about the whole TLD notion.

So thank you for correcting it and then for going further.

Alexandra, can you give the next question, please?

ALEXANDRA DANS:

Yes. Thank you, Avri. The next question is an audio question from Nojus Saad. Nojus.

---

NOJUS SAAD: Hi, Alexandra and the executive team. Thank you. Nojus Saad here from Youth Women Foundation and the ICANN73 Fellowship Program.

My question follows up on Jeff's question, which is: How is ICANN responding to decentralized Web movement of the DNS occurring recently? Is there or will be a mechanism at ICANN for the inclusion of decentralized domain names in the ICANN ecosystem in the future? And how can ICANN regulate the contracted registrars or registrars that are selling those domain names and address the DNS abuses that are occurring in those systems?

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Nojus, for the question. I will give that one to Kaveh, please.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. I think it's a very valid question. So when we talk about DNS namespace, there is one global DNS namespace. If we talk about namespace as we know it today, it is a fact that it is a mathematical tree so we cannot -- and the tree by definition needs to have a similar root.

---

So as long as there is consensus to use one namespace, at the moment, this is DNS. Of course, the consensus can change, and people can switch to another namespace. But until there is this consensus, the DNS namespace is the only one. So any of the alternate roots, they are not part of the global -- or even based on blockchain, they are not part of the global namespace as we know it on the DNS.

So question of adoption aside -- which I think is very important and we need to look into that. But the question of adoption aside, they are not part of the system as long as they are not (indiscernible) from the current namespace root, which is IANA's root server.

So as long as they are not from there, there is no way that they are part of this setup. I think it is important to keep that in mind.

That said, the amount of interest I see on chat and the questions we receive clearly shows that we, as the Board, and I assume we also need to address the Org to put more emphasis on this to understand the other namespaces and keep an eye on it. Because as soon as we see they are getting dominance and acceptance globally, which shows a trend, then we need to act.

---

I saw a nice comment on the chat as well that maybe it is more interesting to look into why people -- what people are doing to link these two, the current global namespace and the other alternatives. Because whenever a new trend in technology emerges, we always see there are some stop-gap measures.

And at the moment, I agree that one of the interesting studies would be to look into the stopgap measures that people are making to link these two worlds because that would guide us to how the future -- or what users are missing and what we can add to the DNS or incorporate in our mission to make sure that those needs are also addressed.

Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Kaveh.

Göran, had you wanted to comment on that or did Kaveh cover it?

GÖRAN MARBY: I think Kaveh covered it. If there was anything else, it was a content thing.

---

ICANN -- we are not doing this. ICANN is not a business proposition. We don't feel competition. In our -- we cover the things that are under, as Kaveh said, our DNS space. That's where we have the contracts for.

The alternative namespaces are happening. We know they are happening. We also think there is -- we did produce a blog about it a while back ago where we actually said, I think, "customer beware."

Our job is to preserve the ability for, what is it now, 5 billion people to interconnect on one system. And that is what we tried to do. The technology behind that should always evolve.

Personally, I think it's important that people have one system that are able to connect to, whatever that system is, but it should be one. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Göran.

Before going to the next question, I just want to stop and remind the many fast-talking people among us that for these, we really need to slow ourselves down. Definitely appreciate the comments. Want to make sure that they are translated into all

---

the other languages properly. And I'm trying to speak slow enough. Please, all, try to speak slowly. Thank you.

Okay. Going to the next question, Alexandra, please.

ALEXANDRA DANS: Avri, the next question is a written question from Sivasubramanian.

Would ICANN consider formulating a new identifier study/research/ or working group, including staff, experts and community participants? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Thank you, Siva, for your question. I've got to see who I've got that wants to answer that one. Do I have someone?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I can.

AVRI DORIA: Maarten.



---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Siva, for the question. At this point, we are not considering it. But as you know, it's a solid part of the strategic plan to see how the identifier system is evolving. So I can see that looking into these issues in some way or another would be predictable. We're following the evolution with interest, and we currently don't have plans.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And I would probably add that we already have a fair amount on the table and priorities, but certainly as new priorities are developed, I think it's important to look into all these issues.

But, Alexandra, please, the next question.

ALEXANDRA DANS: The next question is from Ajay Data in the audio queue.

Ajay, you can --

AJAY DATA: Hello? Good evening. I am Ajay Data here.

So my questions are twofold. One, current situation which is related to the (indiscernible) and the pandemic.

---

My question is: Do we have any plans to look at our financial corpus increase potentially to deal with the situations for long term?

And, also, what do -- do we need to take some steps further so that ICANN remains definitely without any pressure of any government or any political situation and really remain neutral Internet for all, for stable Internet. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Thank you very much for those questions.

I think the first one on the financial plans, if I could, I would pass to Danko first. And then perhaps come back to someone else for the second question.

Danko, are you willing to talk to that one?

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Sure, Avri. As you know, I'm always happy to talk about money.

AVRI DORIA:

Exactly why I called on you.

---

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yeah. My name is Danko Jevtovic. And Ajay, thank you for the question.

As you know, ICANN has a reserve fund. And during this pandemic, years now, we had part of our income that wasn't spent according to our plans because of the impossibility to travel and also the number of registered domains increased more than we expected.

So we -- the Board has decided to put part of these funds into the reserve fund and to increase our reserves in order to be ready for any unexpected (indiscernible).

So we have a decision that the level of the reserve fund has to be at least 12 months of our operating costs. And currently the reserve fund is above that level. It's approximately the level of 15 months, so this is something the Board has done.

Also, part of this -- this money was used to create SFICR, supplemental fund for implementation of community recommendations. That is planned to be used for the multilevel significant projects initiated by community recommendations. We are well-funded not only for -- in case of emergency but also

---

to finance and to fund all the community on the projects that are coming from the community recommendations.

The second part of your question about political pressure, I believe there is some other Board members who would like to say more. But I would just say that ICANN is part of the world. And I believe we have to be there because it's impossible to live outside of this blue ball that is rotating in the universe.

So who would like to take that, Avri?

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Danko. Yeah, first. And then I will try to pass it on.

That whole jurisdictional question was a big part of the transition. It does have pending questions for us in the future. It is one of the things that we are very careful to try and avoid, to try and anticipate and to deal with. But perhaps, Maarten, you would like to add something to that? If I can impose on you as our chair.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

It's reflecting on the discussions we've been having on this. But for us, it's very clear that the art to facilitate the world in this unique identifier system delivery. And in that, yes, governments will try to impose pressure on us as well try to balance us out

---

because our independence is the guarantee for availability of the system to the world.

So in that way, when five years ago -- just over five years ago, the U.S. government handed over the mandate to the multistakeholder community, I think that was a marker in time that we can continue to live up to, as long as we as an ecosystem continue to demonstrate that we're good shepherds, as I think -- I believe we do today.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Maarten.

Do I have anyone else that wanted to comment on that? No, I don't.

So please, Alexandra, can you give me the next question.

ALEXANDRA DANS:

Yes. The next question is a written question from Luis Rolfo, NextGen. Out of curiosity, what is the rationale behind ensuring registries and registrars remain separate entities? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. Thank you, Luis, for that.

---

Becky, can I go to you with that question, both for current perspective? You've got very much the historical perspective for why they are.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you very much.

So initially registries and registrars were separated as a means of introducing competition into the domain name registration system.

In 1998 with respect to the generic top-level domains, obviously, not ccTLDs, but generic top-level domains, one company ran .COM, .NET, and .ORG and served as both the registrar and the registry for those.

And when ICANN was conceived and came into being, we knew that it would take some time to establish new top-level domains that could introduce competition at that level. But it was relatively easy to introduce competition at the registrar, registration level itself.

And so the U.S. government at that time required VeriSign, which was up until that time running .COM, .NET, and .ORG, to build a system that would enable additional registrars to sell and register

---

names in .COM, .NET, and .ORG. So that is the basis of it. It was very much intended to introduce competition and to sustain the growth of competition as ICANN -- as the management of the DNS names -- identifiers were being transitioned out of the U.S. government.

There's some debate about why that separation still exists. And there was -- there have been many times in the history of ICANN when the question of vertical integration, which is to say one registry and one registrar, serving a single integrated and -- serving -- registering people in those domains.

In a kind of very traditional, economic, and competition theory, one would normally assume that vertical integration produces efficiencies so long as there is not a dominant player at either the upstream or downstream part of this.

So either, you know, a dominant registry or a dominant registrar, those are places where -- what's considered vertical integration is generally thought to be potentially problematic for competition.

I do think that as new models of top-level domains emerge, that there are reasons to think through that policy.

---

We did think through that policy once many years ago. And I think it must have been as far back as 2006 or something like that. And the community did relax vertical integration, so there are -- companies can be both a registry and a registrar that are related. But they do have to maintain appropriate separation and they do have to provide equal access to other competing registrars.

And I think, as I said, that is all borne out of the goal of promoting competition. And as the world changes, it's appropriate from time to time to think about that, particularly as we have new models of top-level domains.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Becky. Thank you for that.

And, yes, to any of us that do remember that vertical integration working task, it's a task we should approach very carefully if we approach it again. Just even bringing up the memories of it makes me want to be cautious.

Alexandra, can you tell me who is next, please.

ALEXANDRA DANS:

The next person is in the audio queue, it's Mason Cole. Mason?



---

AVRI DORIA: Please.

MASON COLE: Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Go ahead.

MASON COLE: I'd like to follow-up on Steve DelBianco intervention on DNS abuse.

By my count, within the ICANN sphere, there are at least five small groups and/or industry initiatives talking about DNS abuse, which is encouraging and applaudable but doesn't reach all the bad actors where they hide. Even if some data indicates progress on abuse, it remains a problem. If it weren't, we wouldn't have so many efforts to address it.

Recognizing that the community is in the lead and following industry efforts and others' efforts to encourage hard action on DNS abuse, is there finally an opening for ICANN org to join industry efforts with their own and level the playing field to reach the bad actors who refuse to join voluntary efforts?

---

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So I'm looking to see who to pass --

GÖRAN MARBY: As this was directed to ICANN org, I think I should answer it.

AVRI DORIA: Please.

GÖRAN MARBY: Sorry.

First of all, thank you for bringing this up. It's not like ICANN org doesn't do anything. First of all, we have established -- we started with the health indicators. We have -- we have the DAAR system, which I think is a fairly well-recognized system for about how to look at abuse. We have asked -- in short we'll have an agreement with the registries about getting access to the same information we got from the Verisign agreement. And we have the DNSTICR which, you know, has been I think successful when it comes to help with certain types of abuse.

---

So -- And apart from that, all of the -- many of those groups that exist in the ICANN community we are supporting actively. We are -- we are there to facilitate the discussion within the community. But I know that you didn't mean that -- that we don't do anything, because I know you recognize.

For instance, there is -- you know that I, during some of the calls, actually showed a graph in my background, which I'm not going to do now, that we use the same methodology as the European Commission report to make a trend line that was back also when GDPR was started, when GDPR came around to show the trends of this as well.

We will -- There's a blog coming out with more of this data in the next couple of days, and that actually gives our role. And it's up to you and the community to then define if there's any changes in the policies, in the contracts, in the agreements. That has to come from the ICANN community, because this is, as you know -- and I know you agree with me, this is a bottom-up, multistakeholder model.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Göran.

---

Thank you, Mason, for the question.

And as I'm about to pass off the -- the task of going with the questions, I do want to thank you all for slowing down somewhat and remind you to keep thinking about it.

Patricio, please take the floor. Thank you.

**PATRICIO POBLETE:** Thank you very much, Avri. And hello, everyone, from Santiago, although I'd rather be in San Juan, as many of you.

Who is next in the queue, Alex?

**ALEXANDRA DANS:** Patricio, the next question is a written question from Roelof Meijer: As you might be aware the CENTR Board decided last week to suspend the membership of the manager of .RU. On the other hand, the ccNSO published a statement that, through the Council, condemns the use of weapons to resolve differences. The ccNSO Council believes that it is crucial that the ccNSO remains impartial and does not take position with regard to domestic political disputes, international conflicts, or wars, and should remain a trusted partner of all ccTLDs managers.

---

Does the ICANN Board share the position stated in the previous phrase? And if so, is that position independent of whatever scale the present conflict in Eastern Europe might escalate to?

Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: I think Maarten can answer that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, no. Thank you, it's Roelof Meijer, by the way, for those who aren't used to the Dutch.

But Roelof, thank you for your question. Yes, we are aware of the CENTR Board's decision, and yes, we do share the position that we should remain impartial and not take positions with regard to political disputes as such.

We believe that our role is to ensure that the Internet functions as well as we can facilitate it, and that's maybe even a lifeline for the users in the end. Hence, very much committed to that.

Thank you.

---

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Maarten.

Alex, who is next in the queue?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Patricio, the next question is from Jonathan Zuck in the audio queue.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Jonathan Zuck here for the record.

As we're talking about alternate roots a little bit and trying to stick to our own knitting in terms of the root that ICANN maintains, the credibility of that seems to be -- will have a spotlight on it going forward. And I guess there's three issues that might affect that credibility, one being universal acceptance, because the more I see comments in the chat about how difficult it is to use these alternate roots, we can't ignore how difficult in some aspects it is to use our own root.

---

And then the other is I was curious where the Board conversations on closed generics and geographic names and how those were progressing, if there was anything there to report.

Thanks.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Jonathan. And let me see who -- who can take that question.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Jonathan, may I ask for a clarification on the first part of your question? Because you say access in our own root. You mention IMRS, ICANN operator root, is not as easy. Can you please clarify that, what you mean by that?

I don't think we have Jonathan anymore on the microphone.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Can we allow Jonathan to speak?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I'm just glad it wasn't me asleep at the wheel here on the muting.

---

I guess what I was saying is that the continued complexities associated with the use of IDNs, for example, is a case where the root that ICANN is responsible for is difficult to use, right? And so this idea that these alternate roots are difficult to use is -- becomes ironic when we still have such a long way to go in terms of universal acceptance.

So that was just one of three things that popped into my head as credibility problems, if you will, associated with the ICANN maintained root.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Fair enough. Thank you. I think it's clear. I confused it with ICANN root server operations. So, being yes, basically the namespace, especially with internationalization, is not the most user-friendly playing in that namespace, the DNS global namespace. And I agree, I think that's something to look into in the efforts of universal acceptance. I mean, that's the frame for that, efforts to figure out weak points and find possible solutions for that. So I fully agree. Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE:

--



---

GÖRAN MARBY: Can I add something? Can I add something, please?

Jonathan, I know you that didn't mean this. I just want to make sure. The DNS today and the identifier system serves about five billion people around the world together with the (indiscernible) protocols, together with the whole ecosystem. It's actually, in simpleness, a fairly -- it's a fantastic technology in the sense that there are many companies, you know, involved in the value chain of this. If you just take the technical part, the independent root server operators, the resolvers, and all the way into the telecom operators and ISPs around the world which are in the hundreds of thousands, plus, of course, the web browsers and everything else.

So I wouldn't say -- there are things we need to address, and you know that universal acceptance and IDNs, et cetera, et cetera are extremely important for me. It was mentioned before it was a pet project of mine, and it is. But the point of the matter is that the system has been fantastically sustainable. Last year in November, I think it was, it was the biggest Internet day ever, and if I got my numbers right, there was more than eight trillion requests into the system, and the system didn't even pause. So I think we should be proud of it.

---

I know you didn't mean anything else, JZ, but I just want to mention that.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you, Göran.

And about the second part of the question, I think Maarten can address the issue of closed generics.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, on closed generics, that's one of topics that we identified as something that really needs to be resolved as there is a GAC advice and a GNSO opinion. And both GNSO and GAC have agreed to engage with each other to discuss how best to deal with this matter. And the Board has offered its availability to help facilitate this interaction. So we recently sent -- actually, today we sent a letter and a proposed framework to GNSO and GAC to continue to work on this. And we look forward to the results of that interaction.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Maarten.

Alexandra, who is next in the queue?

---

ALEXANDRA DANS: So we have a written question from Almad Aghar, ICANN73 fellow.

The question is: As it might not be feasible to do inclusion of alt DNS and since they are quickly gaining popularity, while they are not governed by a unified body, is it a good idea for ICANN to start considering integrating with alt DNS in order to eliminate collisions and maintain a workable unified DNS even if it is a DNS umbrella rather than a single DNS? For example, ICANN can offer the option for those alt DNS that cross a certain number of transactions.

Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay. Jim, please.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Patricio, and thank you for the question. There's been quite a bit of discussion today about alternate roots and integration with them.

I think it's important to acknowledge that the alternate root issue is much more than the name collisions and much more than

---

simply suggesting that we integrate with them and somehow find a way to work together.

There's a fairly substantial technical issue going on here in the way that the Internet works. ICANN operates and maintains and seeks to continue a single, unique root system. You know, these other namespaces certainly come into existence. They like to use names that look a lot like the names in our particular namespace. And, yes, that creates problems, but it's not really a problem that ICANN can solve. And that really is part of what's going on here.

It's more than we can discuss in this forum, so certainly we should look for other opportunities, and perhaps another forum, if we have another forum about other namespaces as we've had several times at ICANN meetings in the past here. Our office of the Chief Technology Officer certainly runs those forums, and they have several times in the past. We can dig more into these issues and the discussion of what to do with them.

So thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE:

Thanks, Jim. And about the possibility of coordinating with some of these roots, it's hard to see how one could coordinate with

---

some of them that are founded on the basis of absolute lack of coordination.

So let's go to the next person in the queue.

ALEXANDRA DANS: Thank you, Patricio. The next question will be an audio question. And just a reminder also, because of the time, we'll be closing the Q&A pod and the audio queue also for questions.

So our next question is from Sebastien Bachollet.

Sebastien.

PATRICIO POBLETE: You're muted.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I was, but it was not my fault.

Thank you very much. I will speak in French.

My name is Sebastien Bachollet. And first of all, I will speak as EURALO chair. I have a special hat for this, but unfortunately, I am not allowed to turn on my camera so you can't see it.

---

But as far as I'm concerned, it is important that all RALO members today can participate in the discussions that we are holding. Just because a government took up a certain position, it shouldn't be to the detriment of the RALO members. I wanted to make sure that we remain open on that front.

I wanted to ask this question during Avri's block, but perhaps this will be an opportunity for her to answer. I wanted to know why the ATRT review, which is actually a review of reviews, why it is subject to the prioritization even as it should be the one that evolves the way that reviews work. And especially in relation to the holistic review of ICANN.

Thank you for your attention. But, actually, I have one more thing I want to mention. What projects can be financed by a SFICR? I'm not sure I understand how it is meant to be used, but I'm certain that you have excellent ideas on this.

Thank you very much.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay. Let's first go to Avri, then.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, thank you.

---

One of the reasons that it is being put in the priority queue is because of the work involved. That was part of the decision that the Board made, that at a certain point of time, we put all of them; however, the Board did take the prioritization activities out of that queue and sort of say but as ATRT suggests, we really need to start the prioritization, you know, as quickly as we can.

Beyond that, in terms of the holistic review, and I think I discussed this in a couple different sessions, is while doing that review, which is a review that many constituencies, SOs, ACs had questions about and such, is -- we've gone out to the ATRT3 shepherds to try and work with them to get the terms of reference for that started. So that assuming you are right, and it does end up at the top of the priority queue, when that happens, we'll be closer to getting it to start in itself.

And the third point I want to make is having talked to several constituencies, stakeholder groups, SOs, ACs, over the course of this week and before, we've seen that a lot of them have really started thinking about the self-improvement process and what that takes. And since that really does need to be very bottom-up before the holistic community can look at it, I think that while it is waiting on the queue, it has sort of started, but for the bulk of the work, like changing bylaws that require a fair amount of

---

community time for review and consideration, we're waiting to see the prioritization.

Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Avri.

And about the Supplemental Fund for Implementation of Community Recommendations, SFICR, Danko, please.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you, Patricio.

Danko speaking. You managed to spell out our acronym. That's fantastic.

PATRICIO POBLETE: With practicing.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yeah. The SFICR fund is a way how to bring more governance, financial governance, to the way how we use our financial resources in implementation of the community recommendations. So the key to that was -- is that a fund is



---

dedicated to projects that are multiyear, that are result of the community recommendations, and they're a significant expenditure.

So one of the primary examples is that a project to implement the SSAD, the result of the GDPR PDPs, is a very good example of something that can be financed from the SFICR.

Having said that, I just wanted to add two different examples of significant projects that are not SFICR-related. One of them is auction proceeds that Board is preparing to hear, to communicate with org and to get information about that in next month. And the auction proceeds realization will be done by the funds that are auction proceeds funds.

And also, in preparation for the SubPro, we are currently in the ODP phase, and that money is coming from the new gTLD fund that is, well, from the previous round, but all of that new gTLD project is one specific fund.

So by segregating these funds, we are bringing more visibility, and we will be doing reporting separately for these funds so the community will have exact information how the money is spent and how the projects are progressing.

---

Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you, Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: I hope that answers Sebastien's question.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Alexandra, who is next?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Thank you, Patricio. The next question is a written question from Shoshiro Shonesha (phonetic).

What is the current status of the next root KSK rollover plan?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay. For that question, please, John Crain, you can take that.

JOHN CRAIN: Thank you. Hopefully, you can hear me.

Work on the next KSK rollover was paused due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

---

We're waiting for as the constraints on travel and gatherings lift. And then we'll re-evaluate the viability of generating new KSKs, and we'll revise our plans accordingly.

There was a consultation with the community about frequency, et cetera. And I will post a link to that into the chat.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you, John.

Alexandra, the next question, please.

ALEXANDRA DANS: Patricio, the next question is from Werner Staub.

Werner?

WERNER STAUB: Thank you. Can you hear me?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yes.

WERNER STAUB:

We've seen over the last couple of years how hard it is to work with subjects like data access or what we now call SSAD data accuracy, data abuse mitigation, and privacy.

Now, this is mostly because privacy stands in conflict with the other three because accountability is kind of the opposite of privacy if we don't change a couple of habits that date back to the last millennium.

And that habit that dates back to the last millennium is an outdated way of documenting accountability. Now we're changing it partly. It used to be that simply, crudely publishing information about the domain holder was the way to make them accountable. You know, if you put in the wrong email address, you know, the -- somebody else who had that email address could take over the domain. That was -- the published information was the way to control the domain name.

But now we have registrars, we have an ecosystem where the actual means of control over domain name is totally disconnected from the published information, and the published information has essentially become almost meaningless.

---

And even meaningless when the actual domain holders actually wish to publish the information.

So if we change that, folks, a little bit, you know, we could -- be a problem (indiscernible) further.

So my first question is, do we have a chance of changing our focus from one that is on obligations, we want to force people to do something, to a focus where we try to make options available, such as allowing domain holders who wish to show that they are accountable to do so and make technological tools available for that, such as modern things as a secure hash over key registration data or using things like modern identity protocols.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks. I think -- Becky, do you want to take that?

BECKY BURR: Thank you for a very interesting question.

I think -- I don't agree, respectfully, with the notion that privacy and accountability are sort of opposite ends of the spectrum. And so while I absolutely agree that bad actors should be accountable for bad behavior, I don't think that the solution is to allow unfettered and unaccountable access to personal data. There has to be something in between this. And I think we can all agree

---

or disagree whether gTLD got it right or whether we know where gT- -- gTLD, sorry -- GDPR got it right or didn't get it exactly right. But I would not want to -- I just don't want to make that sort of diametrical distinction.

Having said that, your suggestion that registries and registrars should be free to do other things, I mean, registries and registrars have an obligation under the contract to provide reasonable access to registrant data to those with legitimate interest -- legitimate and proportionate interest. That is the requirement in the contract.

And I don't think that this precludes looking at different ways of ensuring that when information, personal data, is needed, the people who are accessing that data are accountable for their uses of it.

So -- I encourage this out-of-the-box thinking about different ways to solve the problem, because I think we need a lot of that thinking. But I just think that everybody's got a dog in this -- in this situation.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Becky.

---

Alexandra, who do we go to next?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Thank you, Patricio. The next question is from Brian Beckham.

The question reads: In DNS abuse discussions, the role and ability of Web host to take action or facilitate the taking of action is often raised. In particular, to complement efforts outside the ICANN framework, are there or have there been, or should there be efforts to bring Web hosts into the ICANN steering group framework?

Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you for the question.

Let's see who can take it.

Becky?

GÖRAN MARBY: Sorry. Oh, let's let Becky.

---

PATRICIO POBLETE: Becky, and then Göran maybe.

BECKY BURR: Thanks.

ICANN has a limited and very clearly articulated mission which relates to the Internet's coordination of the Internet's unique identifiers. It's never been suggested to me that Web hosting service providers would fall into that category. So I do think it's - - it's a bit out of our remit.

Having said that, there are lots of registrars who are also hosting -- provide hosting services and the like. And so I think that there is a lot of overlap in how these operate. But I think, fundamentally, this is not in ICANN's remit, so we would be looking at a different -- a different ICANN.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you, Becky.

Do we have time for another question, Alexandra, or not?

ALEXANDRA DANS: The next question, maybe, is from Chris Disspain.



---

So, Chris, you're allowed to talk.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Can you hear me?

ALEXANDRA DANS: Yes.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Wonderful.

Thanks, and hello, everybody.

In the last month, the ccNSO and the ICANN community has lost one of its own. Dotty Sparks de Blanc, the ccTLD manager for .VI, and the matriarch of the ccTLD community, has left us. The ccNSO mourns her and commemorates her life. And I know that many of the rest of the ICANN community knew her well. And so when we all virtually go home in the next hour or two, may I ask that we all raise a glass in memory of our Dotty.

Thank you.

---

PATRICIO POBLETE: Many thanks for your remarks, Chris. We all loved Dotty. We'll never forget her.

And with that, I think I'll hand this back to Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, thanks, Chris.

And thanks, all, for a lively and interesting public forum.

I really would like to thank everybody who participated today.

Also to my colleagues on the board, thank you for your participation and your responsiveness.

And a great thanks to you -- to our language service professionals. And thank you for keeping us -- up with us, with our speeds. And with our accents. We are diverse in that aspect as well.

So we look forward to see all at the ICANN74 policy forum at The Hague, and in a return to hybrid meetings, we fully anticipate the sessions to work as well as we've been able to evolve the virtual meetings, with inclusive participation, whether you are physically attending or participating virtually. It will not be perfect in the

---

beginning, but it will be as good as we get it together. And we'll make it better. So thank you all for today. And after this, there will be a public board meeting.

Thank you for participating in the forum and hoping to -- and looking forward to see you in The Hague in June.

Thank you, all, very much.

This meeting is closed.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]